

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A663

Easy Answers to Wheat Problem," and include its herewith:

**THERE ARE NO EASY ANSWERS TO WHEAT PROBLEM**

There are no easy answers to any part of the Nation's wheat problem.

That's the message that comes through loud and clear, no matter whether you are talking about President Lyndon B. Johnson's farm message, the congressional debate in the House Agricultural Committee, or the several speakers who tackled the wheat problem before the Fargo Farm Forum here Thursday and Friday.

Out of the extensive discussion, though, comes one glimmer of hope. It was reported here and in Washington that the wheat carry-over by the summer of 1965 might well be at the point where it could be regarded as a necessary reserve instead of a surplus.

Dr. Ted Rice, economist for the Continental Grain Co., the firm which has sold so much wheat and durum to Russia, told the Farm Forum that the Secretary of Agriculture has recognized that it is prudent and desirable for the United States to carry large grain reserves. He has stated that 600 million bushels of wheat and 40 to 50 million tons (1½ to 1¾) billion bushels of feed grains should be considered a reserve not a surplus.

Dr. Rice said such a goal could be met by mid-1965 unless a bumper crop upsets 1964 expectations.

The Russian sales are a major factor in cutting down the wheat in storage, but they also put an extra emphasis on the fact that the American farmer is being subsidized by 50 cents or more for every bushel of wheat he raises.

This subsidy gets a little extra criticism because it becomes matter of public notice every time a sale is made to the Communist bloc countries, and a great many nonfarm Americans have been quick to claim that Russia is being paid a subsidy to buy American wheat.

The sale of American durum—the wheat involved in Continental's first big sale to Russia—came under fire because the subsidy was 72 to 73 cents a bushel, about 15 cents per bushel higher than normal. The administration wouldn't admit it, and neither did the Continental spokesman, but this extra 15 cents was, in fact, a reimbursement to the company because it had to ship half the durum involved in American vessels at higher American freight rates.

It was, in fact, a subsidy to the maritime unions. If American shipping had not been required, the dockworkers would not have loaded any wheat bound for Russia—and there would have been no sales.

But the subsidy is paid on wheat, charged to the Department of Agriculture, and the American farm program gets another black eye. Nobody talks about the subsidy to labor. But it is there for all to see.

The two-price wheat bill sponsored by both Senator MILTON R. YOUNG and Representative MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota, Republicans, would avoid this subsidy on exports, and because of this approach may yet replace the administration-backed bill.

The Young-Andrews bill provides for a certificate plan which would guarantee producers 100 percent of parity on the wheat needed for domestic use, and no subsidies on wheat sold for export. The administration bill, whose sponsors include Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota, and Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, would pay 80 percent of parity on domestic consumption and a lesser subsidy on export wheat, through the certificate plan.

The subsidy approach is under a steady attack from many sources. Take a look at what the Wall Street Journal says:

"It would be wonderful if the Nation had a farm program for all crops which would

do the things President Johnson says a properly revised wheat program should do: Raise growers' incomes, avoid Federal budgetary cost increases, and at the same time prevent a rise in the cost of bread. If, as Mr. Johnson contends, the commodity programs developed during the last 30 years have served us well, it is a little hard to see why the costs, subsidies, surpluses and regimentation involved should now be so staggering."

The Chicago Tribune laments that the President's farm proposals are simply a replay of those advocated by President Kennedy's appointees "who have amply demonstrated they have no faith in the market system. The proposals do demonstrate, however, that the Democrats think the farm vote is for sale and they have what it takes to buy it."

The New York Times has a similar conclusion and contends there are solid economic grounds for dismantling the whole network of Government price supports for agriculture. It comes up with this novel idea: "The place to start is with tobacco, whose chronic use is recognized as injurious to public health. Whether or not to smoke may be a personal decision, but in view of Washington's own concern over the harm caused by cigarettes, it should hardly be promoting the production and consumption of tobacco through artificial subsidies."

This kind of attitude against farm subsidies may force one of the "easy answers" that could bring ruin to major segments of the farm economy. But if the wheat supply gets down to a workable size within the next 12 to 14 months, then we would have time to come up with a program that will work and will be accepted by the nonfarm voters.

**Conservative Party of New York State  
Defends Constitutional Government  
and Congress**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. JOHN R. PILLION**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the pseudoliberals have broken out in a rash of abuse of Congress for its refusal to hurriedly rubberstamp the recommendations of the Executive.

These critics would reform Congress and the present congressional system which provides for the study, public hearings, committee reviews, and debate of legislation. They would like to see this process speeded up. Many of the congressional checks and balances, in their opinion, should be eliminated.

In general these critics are inculcated with a totalitarian psychosis. They would place more and more power into the Executive and its bureaucracy. These shallow pseudoreformers would relegate the people's most direct representatives, the Congress of the United States, to the role of a subsidiary and advisory debating society under the dominance of the President.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times editorial of December 22, 1963, reviews the record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Its destructive criticism is based upon the totalitarian invalid assumption that all recommendations em-

anating from the White House bureaucracy are economically sound, sociologically advantageous, and can be soundly financed.

On December 24, 1963, Mr. Kieran O'Doherty, chairman of the committee on national affairs of the Conservative Party of New York State, wrote a most logical and adequate rebuttal to the New York Times editorial. The New York Times has not seen fit to publish his most excellent defense of Congress and our constitutional system.

Mr. O'Doherty's letter follows:

The NEW YORK TIMES,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your lead editorial of December 22, "Congress Staggers Home," indicted Congress for "ineptitude," rebuked its Members for failing "to fulfill . . . the mandate they carry from the American people," and called for "modernization" of every aspect of the congressional structure. The Times itemized its complaints: Failure to pass the administration civil rights, tax reform, and medicare programs; failure to achieve "basic aid to education"; failure to provide aid for urban mass transportation and more funds for area redevelopment, etc.

The failures with which the Times would indict Congress are, in every instance, failures to act affirmatively upon the programs proposed by the Democratic administration. It seems odd to speak of a mandate from the American people for those programs, in view of the razor-thin margin of victory which put that administration in office in 1960, and the increasingly conservative election returns around the Nation in 1961, 1962, and 1963. It seems stranger still to view Congress as derelict in its duty because it refuses to rubberstamp Presidential proposals to pile still greater spending burdens upon the American taxpayer.

As the Founders envisioned the constitutional system, it is Congress' duty to exercise its independent judgment concerning the Nation's legislative needs. The President proposes, Congress disposes. We should be thankful for those features of the congressional system which insure that this judgment will be exercised in a deliberate fashion, with the greatest possible independence from the influence of demagoguery and emotion.

As New Yorkers, we should also be grateful for the New York Republican delegation to the House of Representatives, which, with a few notable exceptions, has played a leading role in resisting the centralizing effronteries which the Democratic administration would visit upon our constitutional system.

Very truly yours,

KIERAN O'DOHERTY.

**Committee Staffs**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. FRED SCHWENGEL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include an article entitled "Committee Staffs," from the Washington Newsletter of Friends Committee on National Legislation, December 1963:

A664

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 13

## COMMITTEE STAFFS

Representative FRED SCHWENGL, Iowa, has pointed out that while the ratio of Democrats in the House is 3 to 2, the ratio of committee staff members responsible to the Democrats is 8 to 1, thus depriving the Republicans of sufficient staff resources to be able to shape and support an independent position. Northern Democrats complain that 31 of 45 committee chairmen are southerners. If Congress is to improve its ability to exercise oversight of the large executive branch and improve its legislative performance, much will depend on the professional competence, the nonpartisanship and the necessary number of staff. For example, the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee had only 9 staff members to help it deal with the \$49 billion request this year.

## A Fine Week's Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this past 7 days has been a historic period for the House of Representatives. The President's civil rights program is halfway toward enactment, and the Nation has watched in wonder as this House has done its work.

With little bitterness or rancor the most all-encompassing, wide-sweeping civil rights legislation in history has been approved. The leaders of both political parties deserve a great deal of credit for their statesmanship and fairness, and the leaders of the opposition group have conducted themselves in the manner of true southern gentlemen.

All parts of the civil rights program are important and all will have a major effect on the lives and fortunes of our nonwhite population. At long last, a colored family will be able to travel the highways of this country and be assured of a place to eat and a place to sleep.

It is difficult to single out the most significant provision from the total program, but it seems to me that FEPC must rank close to the top of the list. Equality is a mockery if the economic opportunity is not included.

Fears have been expressed that fair employment rights for Negroes will mean fewer jobs for white workingmen. This is not true, of course, and our experience with FEPC in the State of California has proved this point. Many skilled jobs are going unfilled at the present time due to the shortage of skilled labor. Negro and white workers must be assured of full opportunity for these skilled positions, and our Nation will be the real loser if any qualified citizen is deprived of the chance to prove his worth.

All in all, I believe the House can take pride in its recent accomplishments. There can be no more talk of a do-nothing Congress as far as this session is concerned. The 38th Congress is now assured of a place in our history books. The civil rights bill, the tax reform bill, and the various educational bills have

been landmarks of legislative progress. Tributes are due to all concerned, and a particular tribute goes to all Members of this past, fine week's work.

VFW Commander in Chief Lombardo  
Urges Reinforcement of Guantanamo

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Guantanamo Bay crisis clearly demonstrates that the Communist pressure is not only continuing, but is increasing, against U.S. positions throughout all the Caribbean and Latin America.

There can be no question but what Khrushchev and Castro are determined to chase the United States out of Guantanamo Bay. The reasons why the Communists are determined to expel us from that great base are simple ones: First, it is vital to the defense of the United States; second, the Soviet Union wants it as a Red submarine base.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to take positive measures. The threat against Guantanamo is a threat against the United States itself. The Communist master planners know how valuable Guantanamo Bay is to the United States. They know how valuable it would be to the Soviet Union, possessing, as it does, the world's largest submarine fleet.

We have come to expect constructive, strong, and imaginative leadership from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in supporting our national interest in times of crises such as that which we now face. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that the VFW has made a thoughtful and practicable proposal, designed to demonstrate the U.S. interest in Guantanamo Bay and to let the world—our friends and our enemies—know that we intend to stay there.

The VFW commander in chief, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, of Brooklyn, N.Y., proposed in a statement, released to the press February 6, that the United States immediately reinforce defense units now at Guantanamo Bay. I believe that many Members of this House will concur with Commander Lombardo in his belief that such a demonstration of U.S. determination would have a sobering effect on Castro and the Kremlin. Such a publicized sailing of marines from the east coast of the United States as part of a naval task force to Guantanamo would be a clearly understood message that the United States is not going to be intimidated by Khrushchev's and Castro's threats.

Incidentally, it is worth noting that the VFW, comprising 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans, has for a long time taken the lead in alerting our Nation to the value of Guantanamo Bay to the defense of the United States, and in warning our Nation that Guantanamo Bay is a key

target of Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere.

One of the most remarkable and accurate prophecies made in international affairs in a long time occurred the evening of February 3, 1964. On that occasion the National VFW commander, Mr. Lombardo, addressing the Women's Forum on National Security at the Statler Hotel, in Washington, D.C., states that the Communist-inspired trouble in Panama was not an end in itself as far as Communist strategy was concerned. Commander Lombardo said that Panama was the buildup and the steppingstone toward the next major target of communism in the Western Hemisphere, and warned that the next target is Guantanamo Bay. In a matter of only a few days Castro triggered the current crisis. This should illustrate the high qualifications possessed by the national commander of the VFW in making a proposal for U.S. action against Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere.

Because of its strategic soundness and practicability of his proposal, the full text of Commander Lombardo's press release of February 6 pertaining to reinforcement of Guantanamo Bay follows:

## VFW URGES REINFORCEMENT OF GUANTANAMO BAY

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 6.—The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, today urged the immediate reinforcement of Guantanamo Bay "to make it crystal clear to Castro and Khrushchev that the United States means to stay in Guantanamo in spite of the water cutoff by Castro."

Commander Lombardo, who visited the Guantanamo Bay Naval Base a few months ago, said, "Guantanamo Bay is vital to the defense of the Panama Canal, the Caribbean, and the sealand between the United States and South America. We must, therefore, show the Kremlin, and Castro, that we will not temporize, compromise, or negotiate our right to Guantanamo Bay."

Continuing, the VFW leader said, "U.S. determination to stand fast in Guantanamo can be demonstrated by the immediate reinforcement of our defense forces at Guantanamo. I firmly believe that the sailing of marines to Guantanamo would have a sobering effect on Castro and the Kremlin. It would encourage our Latin American friends, who have been long waiting for an indication that U.S. patience with Red troublemakers has a limit. Castro's cutting off the water to our base should also cut off our patience."

Commander Lombardo explained that "Castro's cutting off the water supply should be no surprise. Not only do they want us out, but the Kremlin wants it as a base for the Russian submarine fleet—the world's largest."

Addressing the Women's Forum on National Security in Washington, D.C., February 3, Commander Lombardo stated that the next target after Panama "is Guantanamo Bay."

Concluding, Commander Lombardo said: "The United States has the fleet, and the Marines for a quick reinforcement of our Guantanamo Bay base. Such an immediate reinforcement of Guantanamo will demonstrate to our enemies—and our friends—that we are not going to be timid in using the force we have to defend that which is vital to the defense of our Nation and our friends. It will also let them know we aren't going to be bullied any more by Castro or his Kremlin coaches."